

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

ANDREW JAMES AND JANELL JAMES

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO: 4:18-cv-00005-DMB-JMV

**CITY OF GREENVILLE, TERRACE WIGFALL,
MICHAEL MUIRHEAD, OFFICER HOOVER,
DAVID MASON, AND MARY MASON**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER STAYING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “[A] motion asserting... a jurisdictional defense stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B). Whether to permit discovery on issues related to the jurisdictional motion... [is a decision] committed to the discretion of the court, upon a motion by any party seeking relief.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B).

A motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction has been filed. Doc. #87. Accordingly, staying discovery in this case is appropriate at this time.

If any party desires to take jurisdiction-related discovery, they must file a motion for leave to do so within seven (7) days hereof, setting forth the type and scope of such discovery and an estimated time frame for constructing it. If any party objects to the motion for discovery, it shall file its objection within four (4) days following service of the motion for jurisdiction-related discovery.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED**, pending a ruling on the jurisdictional motion. Defendants shall notify the undersigned

magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting the stay.

SO ORDERED this, November 15, 2019.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE